1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 3 AT TACOMA 4 JIMMY LEROY RAMSEYER, CASE NO. C13-5616 BHS 5 Petitioner, ORDER ADOPTING REPORT 6 v. AND RECOMMENDATION 7 PAT GLEBE, 8 Respondent. 9 10 This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the Honorable Karen L. Strombom, United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. 4), and 11 12 Petitioner Jimmy Leroy Ramseyer's ("Ramseyer") objections to the R&R (Dkt. 5). 13 In 2005, Ramsayer filed a habeas corpus petition that challenged the same 14 conviction as the one he challenges today. See Ramseyer v. Smelser, C05-5006 FDB. The 15 Court denied the petition on the merits (05-5006 FDB Dkt. 49). Ramseyer's third ground 16 for relief in his prior petition contained a claim that his conviction violated due process 17 because the Washington Court held that stipulated facts agreed to pursuant to Cr.R. 4.5(g) 18 were not binding on the state at trial (05-5006 FDB Dkt. 1 at 8). On April 12, 2012, 19 Ramseyer filed another petition raising the same ground for relief (12-5317 BHS Dkt. 5). 20 That petition was transferred to the Ninth Circuit (12-5317 BHS Dkt. 23). 21 As Judge Strombom found, Ramseyer's current petition "raises the same ground for relief." Dkt. 4 at 1. The Court agrees with Judge Strombom's R&R, just as the Court

1	agreed with it in Ramseyer's prior case (12-5317 BHS Dkt. 23). Thus, despite
2	Ramseyer's objection that his case was not adjudicated on the merits, as Judge Strombom
3	found, a review of his prior petitions and orders indicates otherwise. Thus, the Court
4	finds that Ramseyer's petition is a second or successive petition for which the petitioner
5	must seek authorization from the Court of Appeals before filing with the district court.
6	Dkt. 4 at 2 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A) and Ninth Circuit Rule 22-3).
7	Ramseyer's other arguments, that the Court should consider his objections (or
8	perhaps his petition) as a "Refiling of First Petition For Writ of Habeas Corpus" and that
9	equitable tolling should apply because Judge Burgess erred in adopting Judge
10	Strombom's previous R&R, are not relief which this Court can grant. Dkt. 5 at 1 and 3-4.
11	The record in Ramseyer's prior case before Judge Burgess reflects that the Ninth Circuit
12	denied his certificate of appealability (05-5006 FDB Dkt. 67) in that case.
13	The Court having considered the R&R, Petitioner's objections, and the remaining
14	record, does hereby find and order as follows:
15	(1) The R&R is ADOPTED ;
16	(2) Ramsayer's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition (Dkt. 1-1) is TRANSFERRED to the Ninth Circuit as a second or successive petition; and
17	
18	(3) Ramseyer's motion for leave to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> (Dkt. 1) is DENIED.
19	Dated this 6th day of September, 2013.
20	Land Contraction
21	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
22	United States District Judge